

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claims 12-16 remain pending in this application. No claims have been canceled or added.

Information Disclosure Statement

A copy of the second document cited in the June 27, 2005 foreign office action was filed with the Patent Office on September 8, 2005, but was not listed on the PTO-1449. A corrected PTO-1449 Form accompanies this response.

35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103

Claims 15-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Chow et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,874,334). Claims 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chow et al in view of Knudsen et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,584,026). These rejections are traversed as follows.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Chow et al do not teach a "format of execution results". However, the Examiner relies upon Knudsen et al for allegedly supplying this teaching, citing column 31, lines 10-40 and TABLES 34-35.

However, this portion of Knudsen et al does not in any way relate to the "format of execution results" currently claimed. This is because the "format of execution results", according to the present invention, is not a documentation screen

as shown in TABLE 34, as stated at column 31, line 14, and further is not a definer screen as stated at column 32, line 3. At best, TABLES 34 and 35 of Knudsen et al can be said to correspond to the "information" mentioned in claim 12. In other words, claim 12 recites "cataloging information on the correspondence between a SQL user-defined function, calling parameters, a format of execution results and an external routine name".

The format of execution results according to the present invention is a type of hint information regarding handling execution results from an external routine and is used to determine whether to consider each of table data or to consider a set of table data in order to estimate an SQL user-defined function when an execution plan is generated. No such disclosure is provided in or remotely suggested by Knudsen et al. As such, it is submitted that the pending claims patentably define the present invention over the cited art.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

By _____
Shrinath Malur
Reg. No. 34,663
(703) 684-1120